UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,746	08/19/2003	Sofia Hermansson	1018798-000168	3752
	7590 07/31/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	HAND, MELANIE JO		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3761		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/642,746	HERMANSSON ET	AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		

	MELANIE J. HAND	3761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allonon-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil		_
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> M The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:		. Is. Is. Is. Is. Glowall	
/Tatyana Zalukaeva/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761	/Melanie J Hand/ Examiner, Art Unit 3761		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to arguments regarding claims 1-15 and 18: These arguments are directed primarily to the perceived lack of motivation to modify Komatsu to meet all of the limitations of claim 1. These arguments were addressed in detail in the final action and will not be addressed further herein. As to the balance of arguments, regarding the argument with respect to a citation from the MPEP or case law by examiner supporting the position that Komatsu does not teach away from the claimed invention, applicant is no doubt properly acquainted with the concept of "teaching away" as applicant has used this very phrase in their own arguments. Thus a citation of case law or from the MPEP by examiner arguing the opposite position is not considered necessary. Examiner again disagrees with applicant's assertion that only one of the fixing tongues of Komatsu would be sufficient to prevent movement of the article. No direction or specific type of movement that is prevented has been positively recited, i.e. a fixing tongue extending only from the front of the article would certainly prevent front-to-back movement in the longitudinal direction of the article. Firm attachment and immobilization of the claimed pad is not recited anywhere in the claims. As to applicant's request for withdrawal of finality because claim 4 was not listed in the claim heading in the non-final action mailed November 30, 2007, such request is denied and applicant is referred to applicant's own citation on page 8 of the remarks from the preceding final action. The limitations of claim 4 were in fact addressed in the rejection addressing claims 1-3 and 5 but omitted from the claim heading. Thus, since the content was present, applicant has already had an opportunity to address the rejection of claim 4 in the non-final action. Claim 4 is also stated as rejected in the Office Action summary, FORM PTOL-326.